

Report - BB2560 - 2022-09-12

Respondents: 1
Answer Count: 1
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

Please note that there is only one respondent to this form: the person that performs the course analysis.

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):

Lauren McKee, mckee@kth.se

DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS

Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

All students were given the chance to complete an online evaluation form in the weeks following the end of the course. Questions included feedback on group work and a sense of integration in the class community. In the automated LEQ evaluation, answers are pooled by gender, nationality, and disability, wherever a group is large enough for responses to remain anonymous.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

Students were met during seminars, labs, and lectures all through the course, both in-person and online. After the course I exchanged emails with a few students who wanted to give personal feedback on the course or assessment. I and the other teachers are always available all through the course and are happy to meet with students to discuss their learning experiences.

COURSE DESIGN

Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

Over five themes, we use lectures, labs, computer labs, and reading exercises to give deep and broad knowledge of microbial communities. We focus on learning critical and analytical skills, supported by the acquisition of relevant factual knowledge. Our assessments focus on testing skills in wet lab performance, data analysis, data presentation, and critical evaluation of scientific publications. This year for the first time we did not have a timed exam as our final assessment. Instead, we made the lab report an individual graded assignment, and this serves as the basis of the overall course assessment. We had an overall very positive reception of this from students, although next year we will stream-line the grading process, as it took some time this year.

THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If there is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

Yes the workload was expected, according to student evaluations. Over the past 2-3 years of developing the course, we have made changes to ensure that work and assignments are spread throughout the course, rather than all lumped together at the end. This improved pacing makes for a better and less stressful learning experience for students, without compromising our assessment standards.

THE STUDENTS' RESULTS

How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

This year all students took part on the final assignment (the lab report) whereas in previous years there were always a few who did not attend the final timed exam. So we are glad to have a high completion rate. There was a spread of grades in the final assignment, with a good overall level of achievement.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

What was the best aspect:

"The grading is based on the report. This helped to motivate me to follow the course and try my best in the report."
"That we had so much influence over the lab and that all parts of the lab tied into the theories we were supposed to learn."
"The reading of scientific articles in the form of seminars was very productive from a learning standpoint."

Areas for improvement:

Streamline the information given to guide writing the lab report.
Narrow the goals of the lab work.
Be more flexible with word limits in the lab report.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Overall we received very high scores in the evaluation, and this was reflected in the very engaged nature of in-class and email-based discussions I had with students, who clearly enjoyed their learning.

OVERALL IMPRESSION

Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

Students were highly engaged this year, and obviously happy to be back to face-to-face teaching for at least the most important course moments. It was highly appreciated to use the lab report as final assessment, although we have learned that we need to be more concise in giving instructions for this, and to be explicitly clear that it is not a group assignment.

ANALYSIS

Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:

- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

International students gave slightly higher overall scores than Swedish students. Women gave slightly higher scores than men. But all scores were very high and we are satisfied with the evaluation.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

Streamlining instructions for the lab report, and improving the speed and consistency of report grading.

OTHER INFORMATION

Is there anything else you would like to add?

No.
